DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 626 AL 002 357

AUTHOR	Ortego, Philip D.
TITLE	The Linguistic Imperative in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages.
INSTITUTION	Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C. ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics.
PUB DATE	May 70
NOTE	45p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.35
DESCRIPTORS	Bibliographies, Cross Cultural Studies, Cultural Factors, *English (Second Language), Linguistic Theory, *Teacher Education, *Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	Tagmatic Differentials

ABSTRACT

Attesting to the cruciality of the problems involved in the teaching of English to speakers of other languages is an introductory listing of national and international organizations created and committed to the study of TESOL: the English Teaching Information Centre of the British Council, the British Association of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language, the Association of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, the Defense Language Institute, the English for Speakers of Other Languages Program of the Center for Applied Linguistics, the National Council of Teachers of English, the Conference on English Education, Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages the Interagency Committee on English Language Teaching, and the Committee for Cooperation on English in Japan. Presenting a general review of some linguistic considerations in the field of TESOL, the author discusses the following topics: (1) linguistic perspectives, (2) methods of teaching English to speakers of other languages, (3) preliminary considerations, (4) philosophic and pragmatic considerations, (5) cross-cultural correlations of linguistic behavior--tagmatic differentials, (6) the TESOL teacher, and (7) a linguistic model. A bibliography is appended. (AMM)

ERIC EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER

ED038626

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR LINGUISTICS

CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS, 1717 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, N. W., WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE LINGUISTIC IMPERATIVE IN TEACHING ENGLISH TO SPEAKERS OF OTHER LANGUAGES

by PHILIP D. ORTEGO

AL 002 357

ED038626

Foreword

This document has been commissioned by the ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics. A copy of this report has been placed in the ERIC System and is available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. For ordering procedures consult the U. S. Office of Education monthly publication RESEARCH IN EDUCATION or write to the Clearinghouse at 1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20036. Comments concerning the article's contents should be addressed to the author at: Department of English Language and Literature, The University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

A. Hood Roberts, Director
ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics
May, 1970

"This publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

1. Linguistic Perspectives 3

   1.1. Language as a cultural code
   1.2. Social context of language
   1.3. Psychology of linguistic styles

2. Methods of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages . . . 7

   2.1. Grammar-translation method: the primacy of print
   2.2. Direct-association (total immersion) method: the primacy of sound
   2.3. Linguistic method: the primacy of science

3. Preliminary Considerations in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages 12

   3.1. Level of instruction
   3.2. Linguistic aspirations
   3.3. Linguistic norms
   3.4. Role expectations

4. Philosophic and Pragmatic Considerations in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages 15

   4.1. Communication v. codification
   4.2. Strategy v. rules
   4.3. Performance v. competence
   4.4. Perception v. production

5. Cross-Cultural Correlations of Linguistic Behavior: Tagmatic Differentials in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages 20

   5.1. Socio-cultural differentials
   5.2. Psycho-linguistic differentials
   5.3. Phono-physiological differentials
   5.4. Grammatic-syntactical differentials
   5.5. Semantic-cognitive differentials

6. The Teacher of English to Speakers of Other Languages 29

   6.1. Preparation and education
   6.2. Monolingual v. bilingual
   6.3. Ethnic v. non-ethnic

7. A Linguistic Model for Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages 32

7.1. Objectives and stages of instruction
7.2. Sequence of skills
7.3. The curriculum
7.4. The language lab
7.5. Testing and evaluation

8. Conclusion 38

BIBLIOGRAPHY 40

THE LINGUISTIC IMPERATIVE IN TEACHING ENGLISH TO SPEAKERS OF OTHER LANGUAGES

Philip D. Ortego

The teaching of English to speakers of other languages has become in recent times a concern not only of national significance in terms of the role of English in the linguistic renaissance of the past two decades but also in terms of the global role of English in international affairs. For example, from February 27 to March 1, 1969, the first conference celebrating the Tenth Anniversary of the Center for Applied Linguistics was held jointly with the twelfth meeting of the National Advisory Council on the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language (NACTEFL) at Harper's Ferry, West Virginia. The purpose of the joint conference was

> . . . to bring together from the United States, Britain, and the Commonwealth a wide range of people and institutions concerned with the teaching of English to speakers of other language in order that far-reaching discussions could take place on the world-wide aspects of the problem of English teaching, especially in the light of new developments both within and outside the resource countries in this field (Ohannessian, 1969:1).

Moreover, the plethora of national and international organizations created and committed to the study of the problems of teaching English to speakers of other languages attests to the cruciality of the problem, e.g., organizations like the English-Teaching Information Centre of the British Council, the British Association of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language, the Association of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language (ATEFL) of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA), the Defense Language Institute, the English for Speakers of Other Languages Program of the Center for Applied Linguistics, the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), the Conference on English

Education (CEE), Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), the Interagency Committee on English Language Teaching, the Committee for Cooperation on English in Japan, et al. In fact, of all the nations, Japan has by far the most extensive English language program. English has become Japan's second language with about a ninth of secondary school expenditures going for English instruction. The extent of Japan's English language program is evidenced by such facts as (a) Japanese newspaper publishers print five English-language daily newspapers with a circulation of almost 43 million, (b) more than two dozen English-language magazines are printed in Japan, and (c) the Directory of Japanese Scientific Periodicals lists over 260 journals of science and technology as printed in English and 159 in both Japanese and English (Brownell, 1967:13-14).

There is no doubt that the teaching of English to speakers of other languages has assumed growing proportions in the wake of American involvement in the international community. Of course, the primacy of English was a watchword in the British colonial structure long before the U. S. filled in the breach. And through the long decades of British rule, countless thousands of British teachers spent lifetimes teaching English to a variety of foreign peoples. Thus, the need for English-language instruction may have just grown like Topsy. Perhaps more significantly and closer to home, though, is the mounting problem of teaching English to millions of American youngsters whose first language is Spanish and whose facility in English is zero or else severely limited.

However, regardless of the situation or motivations that may engender the requirement for English-language instruction, the fact of the matter is that there are a number of considerations to be taken into account in the undertaking--not the least of which is the attitudinal relationship between the teacher and the learner. Nevertheless, teaching English--or any other language for that matter--to speakers of other languages is not a simple matter of vocabulary acquisition any more than it is simply a matter of structural control. If--as the Whorf-Sapir contention has it--the language we speak shapes our view of the world, then the matter of teaching English to speakers of other language involves a

constellation of individual variables operant in the teacher and the pupil. How best to bring these constellations into a more congruent pattern is the aim of this essay, starting first with a consideration of linguistic perspectives and of the concepts of teaching English to speakers of other languages, then going on to an examination of the individual variables that are perforce a part of the teaching-learning context and which all too often are ignored by teachers of English to speakers of other languages. (In fact, the variables are ignored by most teachers of foreign languages also.) The linguistic model for teaching English to speakers of other languages which I attempt here is based in part on a number of years as a teacher of Spanish and French as well as a teacher of English to Spanish speakers. The model, I think, would work well with any other language also. The essay closes with a consideration of some important points which have arisen in recent years about the preparation the teacher of English to speakers of other languages should have.

1. Linguistic Perspectives

The more we study language, the more we see it as system, and we become increasingly aware that in fact we know very little about it. Though very recently there have been studies and investigations into the realm of linguistic universals in an attempt to find the commonality of languages. Such studies by Greenberg (1963) and Bach (1968) have yielded some important insights into the interrelationships between languages. But unfortunately, too much linguistic research continues to concentrate on the significance of obscure linguistic items or else to ferret out linguistic trivia of interest only to a select few. Of course there is a steady stream of pieces on applied linguistics aided and abetted by the Center for Applied Linguistics. However, apart from the historically philosophic views of language little else had been explored about language as an integral system of human beings, just as the nervous system or circulatory system, until the post World War II linguistic

revolution. Though there were linguistic philosophers like Humboldt, deSaussure, and others, who saw the centrality of language in the lives of human beings, the majority of linguistic commentators saw language in the centuries old light as a gift from God or as something to be ordered and analyzed according to some ancient grammatic formula. That the purpose of language was communication, and its intent meaning, was slow in coming, though by the 19th century the linguistic concepts of Rousseau and Arnauld had made an appreciable dent in the linguistic resistance of scholars and teachers.

Though theories of language abound in the literature of linguistic speculations and investigations, no substantive theories of language, coupling it to the other aspects of man's existence, had really evolved until the 20th century. The contemporary rash of studies in ethnolinguistics, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, and others point toward the growing awareness of the role language plays in our lives. Essentially, most contemporary linguistic philosophers concede that language probably developed concomitantly with the earliest forms of human organization. This assumption is based on the fact that we find fully developed languages as part of the historical past of man to which we have access. According to Joyce O. Hertzler, "Human existence is welded to language." (1965:19)

1.1. Language as a cultural code

If culture is the total set of habits which man learns (Landar, 1966:130), then language must perforce be a part of that set and therefore, in fact, the code through which the "bits" of cultural information are transmitted from generation to generation. And no one would deny the truth of Rousseau's statement that "Speech distinguishes man among the animals; language distinguishes nations from each other; one does not know where a man comes from until he has spoken" (Salus, 1969:138). The language we speak not only shapes and gives meaning to the reality we occupy in the biosphere but it also identifies us as individuals about as surely as our fingerprints--perhaps more. As a result more and

more attention is being paid to the emerging science of "linguistic (verbal) behavior." The symbolic process of language is one that has yet to be plumbed to its fullest.

That the function of language as a cultural code has been largely unexplored until more recent times, and not by philosophers but by anthropologists, has not been due to any linguistic myopia on the part of philosophers but due to the fact that recognition of the relationship between culture and language had to come from the results of precisely the kind of field work among various cultural groups engaged in by Boas, Sapir, Whorf, et al. Where linguistic philosophers were quick to formulate the most fallacious kinds of generalizations about language (its origin, etc.), cultural and linguistic anthropologists were cautious in formulating such generalizations, except in the most precise and guarded terms, and only careful examination of the data. Thus, the verities of such cultural-linguistic field work have refracted the study of language into myriad dimensions.

However, the most compelling argument for language as a cultural code comes from Sapir when he pronounced that "Human beings . . . are very much at the mercy of the particular language which has become the medium of expression for their society" (Mandelbaum, 1964:69).

> The fact of the matter is that the 'real world' is to a large extent unconsciously built up on the language habits of the group . . . . We see and hear and otherwise experience very largely as we do because the language habits of our community predispose certain choices of interpretation (Mandelbaum, 69).

1.2. Social context of language

To be sure, not all human communication is necessarily dependent upon language, but what we call "significant" social intercourse would hardly be possible without it. While language is at once the medium of cultural transmission, it is also the variable factor in what we have come to call "society." Language not only conveys thoughts but such conveyance is part of a social context, the precise nature of which may

be as difficult to assess as the cultural code it embodies. Certainly, the words we choose from the lexicon of our language (or linguistic storehouse) are colored by their social context as well as linguistic and semantic context. Hertzler points out that "how each community or society talks and writes depends upon the socially established, standardized, and acquired sounds and marks" (59). Though the language that individuals may speak comes to them "tailor-made" from their predecessors, the way each individual ultimately uses it, the various tasks to which he puts it, are all predicated on some social context or other. Hertzler called language "the signal product of social activity" (59).

In each language community, words have specific meanings altered only by the intonation of the speaker and by whatever kinetic movements or gestures may be involved as part of the transmission. If the auditor interprets something other than the intent of the speaker, then it may very well be due either to the sophistication of the listener or to the sophistication of the language or both or simply to the lack of facility in the language by either or both parties. Thus, the social relationships of language are complex and at times impenetrable. Yet, if human beings are to live together, their very existence is dependent on the shared knowledge of language. And though language itself guarantees no concensus of aspirations and goals, it is nevertheless the prime instrument for social interaction, regardless of direction.

1.3. Psychology of linguistic styles

Language thus looms not only as a cultural code but as a code of "conduct" also. The psychology of linguistic styles must be viewed as the psychology of personality or of self, for (to paraphrase Rousseau) one does not know a man until he speaks--contrary to the aphorism that "actions speak louder than words." In a persuasive essay, Jum C.Nunnally points out that individual differences in word usage, for example, relate importantly to individual differences in learning, perception, and personality. He writes:

> Important individual differences may be found with respect to many aspects of language behavior, including grammatical style, rate and kinds of information transmitted, speech intonations, and many others (Rosenberg, 1965:204).

No doubt, the acquisition of words (that is, vocabulary) is part of linguistic problem-solving, and as such affects the kind of vocabulary we eventually wind up with. In terms of drive motivation, Nunnally indicates that "if words of particular kinds will facilitate the reduction of a drive, the probability is increased that those words will be uttered" (207). For example, the hunger drive will produce words associated or having to do with food, and so on. In other words, the psychology of linguistic styles is reduced to stimulus-response. In terms of cross cultural correlations of language behavior (discussed later in this essay), the psychology of linguistic styles becomes extremely important. For in terms of language acquisition one must remember that the learning of one's first language as a child is qualitatively different from learning a second language as an adult or even as a "linguistic adult." That is to say, even by a six-year old child who comes to a second language--by choice or otherwise--already in control of the fundamental structure of his first language. The fact of the matter is that the two forms of language learning--first and second language acquisition--are decidedly different. Thus, for more effective second (or foreign) language teaching, it is important to know as much about the psychology of linguistic styles as possible--indeed, far more than one may be ever likely to encounter or to teach. Because language is so intricately involved in human behavior, the psychology of linguistic styles must be one of the prime considerations of the language teacher.

2. Methods of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages

Teaching English to speakers of other languages is in effect no different than teaching a foreign language to English speakers. Despite this similarity, though, the teaching of English to speakers of other

languages has not followed the same pattern of instruction as foreign language teaching has more recently, perhaps, only because most English-language teachers have not been motivationally oriented as <u>foreign</u> language teachers. However, English-as-a-foreign-language teaching has suffered essentially from the same foreign-language learning concepts prevalent until the advent of the "linguistic" approach to language learning.

The revolution in language teaching (English, et al) represents one of the most significant social and educational changes to take place in our lifetime. The "linguistic revolution" may be compared in significance to the "industrial revolution" which affected the lives of people the world over. What has influenced language teaching the most, though, has been the impact of science and technology, producing not only new ways of looking at things but contributing to the development of "automata" designed to facilitate the role of the teacher. Science and technology have produced the "technorriculum"--that is, the curriculum heavily invested with electronic gadgets like tape-recorders, filmstrips, language labs, etc. As a consequence, language teaching today (like Hamlet) hardly resembles what it was two or three decades ago.

2.1. <u>Grammar-translation method: the primacy of print</u>

In terms of sequence of skills (discussed in 7.2)--that is, listening, speaking, writing, and reading--the great emphasis of foreign language methodology had been to stress the primacy of print. For somehow knowledge of the printed word was equated with linguistic comprehension, that a foreign language can only be understood by first translating it into English. And thus, the academic sequence of skills in foreign language learning usually began with reading--the reverse of contemporary methodology followed in the linguistic approach. L. A. Hill, the British linguist and specialist in teaching English to speakers of other languages, has summarized the deficiencies of the "traditional" school of language teaching in what he calls "the mythology of English teaching" (1967:70). He describes fourteen myths, including the "grammatic fallacy" which insisted that "grammatical analysis helps the students to

write better English"(70). Many of us, I'm sure, still know or remember someone who studied some foreign language via the grammar-translation method and who, despite four to six years of study, still cannot <u>speak</u> or manipulate the language orally and who--it probably turns out--can manage reading that foreign language only with the aid of a dual-language dictionary.

Sad to say that much of this misguided stress was brought about by antiquated concepts about the "learned" man and by medieval concepts of language requirements for the aspiring doctoral student as well as by lack of knowledge and understanding about the role of language in the lives of human beings. But the great shame of the grammar-translation method was that is wasted so many student hours in covering material that was to many utterly incomprehensible and/or boring. More shameful though is that the grammar-translation method still prevails in so many parts of the world, but especially in the United States in teaching English to speakers of other languages. Describing the grammar-translation method, the Linguist, David DeCamp, used the following analogy:

> Suppose you wish to play the piano. Someone recommends to you a teacher with a considerable reputation as a concert pianist, and you arrive at his studio eager for your first lesson. Instead of letting you sit down at the piano, however, your teacher insists on lecturing you about the history and construction of pianos, the theory of harmony, and the great piano music of the past. Throughout the lesson, you do not touch the piano, and your teacher plays no more than half a dozen notes as an illustration for his lecture (A. A. Hill, 1969:137).

2.2. <u>Direct-association (total immersion) method: the primacy of sound</u>

To be sure, not all language teaching was being done by the grammar-translation method. Here and there (mostly <u>there</u>, in Europe, not the United States) some schools and individuals were successfully teaching foreign languages (including English) using a more "direct" method. That is, <u>immersing</u> the student in a linguistic environment in which he heard only the target language. That the method worked is attested to

by the fact that the Army Language School at Monterey, California, (and other selected schools, colleges, and universities) adopted the method and turned out great numbers of people linguistically proficient in various languages to fill the espionage and escape-and-evasion requirements of the United States during World War II. By contrast with the grammar-translation method, the direct method assumes that students must first learn associative concepts directly with the foreign words, bypassing the use of English. The point here is to get the students <u>thinking</u> in the foreign language. This "sink-or-swim" technique, however, has given rise to several invidious fallacies which include (1) that learning a foreign language requires "talent" or (2) that some languages are more difficult than others or (3) that mastering a foreign language requires superior intelligence (Hughes, 1968:6-7). Getting back to DeCamp, he describes the direct-association method as follows:

> Suppose you change piano teachers, and your new teacher immediately seats you at the piano and puts a Beethoven sonata on the music rack. "But," you protest, "I can't play this. I've never touched a piano before," "Never mind," your teacher assures you. "I'll play the first few bars, and then you imitate me and try to go on from there. Don't worry if you make a lot of mistakes." By the end of a few lessons and a few weeks of practice, perhaps you can indeed hit the right notes for the first few bars. If you continue long enough, you may even learn to play the entire sonata. . . . I believe, however, that we would all recognize that this method of sudden and total immersion into all the complexities of a difficult piano work is not the most efficient way to learn piano playing (A. A. Hill: 138).

2.3. <u>Linguistic method: the primacy of science</u>

Indeed, nor is the direct-association method of language learning the most efficient. While we recognize that the grammar-translation method was essentially an adaptation of language studies in ancient Latin and Greek to modern foreign languages, the "linguistic" method is less easily described, suffice to say that it is methodologically founded on behavioristic-psychological principles which attempt to approach language teaching and learning in terms of contemporary learning theories.

And while the direct-association method emphasized the primacy of sound--that is, the audio-lingual aspects of language learning--the "linguistic" method relies heavily on the primacy of "linguistic" science. To be sure, the Army Method succeeded because it improved on the direct-association method by not letting students flounder linguistically and by carefully controlling the grammatical patterns of the target language. Considerable importance was placed on mimicry and memorization (mim-mem) through dialogues. But the linguistic method goes on to place more emphasis on a variety of drills like recognition and discrimination drills as well as emphasis on phonological and structural contrastive analyses of the speaker's language and the target language. The point is that the linguistic method requires students not only to control the structural components of the target language they are learning but to go beyond the learned patterns to the point of producing new sentences on their own in the same way we can produce any number simply because we've learned how to control the numeric symbols. Above all, though, the linguistic method does not attempt to teach a foreign language in the same way a child acquires his first language. Instead, the linguistic method utilizes the linguistic habits of the learner in order to effect the necessary language transfer. To use DeCamp's explanation once more, he says of the linguistic method:

> If you are wise, however, you will also abandon your second piano teacher and look for a third, one who will indeed require you to practice the piano from the very beginning, but who will not hesitate to give you an explanation as well as a demonstration if he believes that it will help you, and, most important of all, one who will carefully control the musical patterns which you are to learn. This teacher will ask you to practice scales and finger exercises so that you attain proficiency in the fundamentals. He will start you off with simple one-line melodies in the key of C, with simple, straightforward rhythms. He will introduce the complexities of music one at a time: playing chords, sharps and flats, and more complicated rhythms. You will progress through carefully graded stages until you arrive at a level of proficiency high enough for you to try the Beethoven sonata (A. A. Hill: 138-139).

3. Preliminary Considerations in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages

Though we have discussed some linguistic perspectives and considered briefly the principal historical methods of teaching English to speakers of other languages, there are still other considerations to be taken up in the process of teaching English to speakers of other languages. First of all, some of the preliminary considerations have nothing whatever to do with the language itself but with what we might call the "pre-lexic" aspects of language learning; that is, the *a priori* objectives in the study of a foreign language. All of these considerations are really the concern of the teacher more than they are the concern of the student. As Mary Finocchiaro suggests, "Some of our teaching procedures will vary depending upon the students we are teaching" (1964:31). But more importantly, our teaching procedures will vary in terms of the following preliminary or pre-lexic considerations.

3.1. Level of instruction

Certainly *age* and *ability* are important pre-lexic considerations in determining the level of instruction in teaching English to speakers of other languages. Young children, for example, can learn a second language through the medium of games, songs, etc. while adults will almost certainly prefer a more intellectual but motivating approach. However, even though we may have, let us say, two youngsters of equal age and ability, it is likely that a different level of instruction will be needed for the more verbal of the two. Also, the extent of the prospective language learner's knowledge of his own language will determine the level of instruction and the kinds of linguistic contexts for the language learning. According to Professor P. D. Strevens, "The axiom of modern methods of language teaching is that, ideally, every different language teaching situation requires its own specific teaching materials" (1965:31). In other words, the content, say, of English language learning for an Arabian oil engineer should deal with the lexicon of his profession rather than with absurdities like "My aunt's pen is on the

table." In addition, previous language-learning experience of the student will necessitate a particular level of instruction, also. Needless to say, the proficiency and experience of the teacher will also influence the level of instruction. Furthermore, the level of instruction is influenced by the extent of the learner's knowledge of the target language, as well as by the particular kind of English he speaks: British or American, etc.

3.2. Linguistic aspirations

As teachers of English to speakers of other languages we need first of all to determine the linguistic aspirations of our students and the objectives in our teaching. For example, is our job to make coordinate bilinguals of our students? Such a task is not only an imposing one but requires a rather complex and extended learning environment. Although, if the student's needs are such that he hopes to achieve bilingual parity in the target language (English in this case), then the teaching considerations must be aligned in such order that will best realize the student's needs. If the student needs only enough English to get a job, the linguistic objectives are then rather apparent. So, too, the linguistic objectives are rather clear if the student wants to learn only enough English to get by in an English-speaking country. However, should he need to know English to the extent of running a business in English or for graduate (even undergraduate) work in an English-speaking college or university, then the linguistic aspirations place a particular kind of task before the teacher. Or, say, the task is one of teaching English to Spanish-speaking youngsters in the American Southwest in order to bring them into the mainstream of American society. The aim here then is to make Spanish-speaking children into functional bilingual individuals, and our approach and methodology must reflect those aims. "The development of literate bilinguals," as Marckwardt says, "poses certain questions of sequence" (Allen, 1965:6). In other words, particular linguistic aspirations require particular pedagogical strategies.

3.3. Linguistic norms

In his study of non-standard English, William Labov indicates that "sociolinguistic behavior . . . . reflects a set of norms, beliefs, or subjective attitudes towards particular features and towards language in general" (1969:27). These norms have to do with the linguistic forms of the target language in terms of the value assigned to them by the majority of the speakers of that language. In American English, for example, the idiolectic den for then or woikin for working or Cubar for Cuba represent regional norms that are acceptable in realistic linguistic contexts but not in the learning situation--even of the region. Thus, there are sets of language which are all predicated on either regional or social standing, and whose values are reinforced either consciously or unconsciously by the teacher. In other words, teaching English to speakers of other languages involves consideration of norms for "correct" public language, and should involve as well consideration of norms for vernacular language. Admittedly some vernaculars may sound more prestigious than others. But the point in this consideration is that the teacher of English to speakers of other languages should be careful not to depreciate or stigmatize the vernacular speech of others.

3.4. Role expectations

Not the least of these preliminary considerations is the nature and extent of role expectations on the part of the teacher for his students, on the part of the students for themselves, and on the part of society for the students. In other words, to what extent is the study of a foreign or second language expected to change or alter the behavior of the student? Since, as Cervenka has pointed out, "Everyone takes as a matter of principle that the purpose of teaching and studying a second language is to know the culture--the way of life--of the native-speaking users" (Aarons, 1968:3), how will this knowledge enculturate the student? To what degree will his patterns of behavior be modified by the study of a foreign language? Though this is the most nebulous areas of second language learning, the answer, I think, depends greatly on the

qualifications and expertise of the teacher, and only secondly on the extent to which the "culture" as represented by and in the language has been internalized by the student. However, it should be noted that teaching a second language is not <u>necessarily</u> teaching a second culture. Though, certainly, culture, like the particles of a solar wind, are being infused by the student the more he is exposed to the language. Therefore, to use a term from psychology, how is the student's "terminal behavior" affected? Does the student function differently as a result of the lessons? Evidence that the student's terminal behavior has been altered lies in the fact that the student can (hopefully) communicate in the target language, for this after all has been the desired terminal behavior. But as has been pointed out, students who have studied foreign languages via the grammar-translation method or direct-association method have ended up with no appreciable alteration of terminal behavior--at least as far as the language learning was concerned. Thus, according to Bowen, the extent to which the student's terminal behavior has been altered is "a reflection of the effectiveness of the teaching (plus whatever aptitude and motivation the student brings to the classroom)" (Aarons, 1968:19). Bowen goes on to suggest that "knowing what terminal behavior we seek should be useful in the design of our teaching" (19). Therefore, the teacher should select and arrange activities that lead directly to the acquisition of the expected behavior and role expectations.

4. <u>Philosophic and Pragmatic Considerations in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages</u>

There was a time when language learning consisted simply of a teacher, a pupil, and a textbook, and somehow these three ingredients were expected to interact and to fuse into some significant linguistic process. There was hardly ever thought to what <u>kind</u> of English, for example, was to be taught, for there was never any question but that "standard" English was to be the subject. Somehow the language in

question as it was taught never really squared with the way it was spoken in real life. The way it worked in the classroom was seldom the way it worked in the streets or in the homes. Of course this description could just as well apply to English-as-a-First-Language programs, for the fact of the matter is that language pedagogy in its entirety has reflected a rather arbitrary set of linguistic norms.

Apart from the deficiencies, though, of English language instruction for native speakers, what philosophic and pragmatic considerations should the teacher of English to speakers of other languages take into account? I suppose ideally we would say that the study of English as a second or foreign language should result in an awareness and understanding of the fundamental patterns of English-speaking cultures. Though there is a wide variance between the ideal and the actual. For example, Albert Marckwardt, writing about our early involvements in teaching English as a second language in Puerto Rico and the Philippines, discloses that:

> In general our technique was quite simple. We simply assumed that we had a typical American school, in terms of both educational aims and operation, and then proceeded as we would in Muncie, Indiana, or Topeka, Kansas. We ignored the fact that English was neither the first language nor the home language of the children and that they were growing up as products of a totally different culture. Until very recently schools in some of our island possessions and trust territories were still proceeding upon the same premise. Nor were British practices much of an improvement over ours. I have seen elementary readers used in the schools in Jamaica which had been designed for England, perversely irresponsive, one might almost say, to the real needs of the children (Allen: 6).

What are the <u>real</u> English language needs of speakers of other languages? This is obviously not an easy question to answer, though, at least philosophically and pragmatically, we might look at the following.

4.1. <u>Communication v. codification</u>

One of the first philosophic-pragmatic considerations must address itself to the question of whether the target language is being learned

for communication or codification; that is, to convey thoughts and concepts in the target language, either orally or graphically, or simply to manipulate the symbols as in paradigms. Of course no teacher would admit to the latter. And since teaching a foreign language is above all a task concerned with the spoken language, we would all say that our objective in teaching English to speakers of other languages is to enable them to communicate in the language. But this is easier said than done.

First of all, in the teaching process many teachers resort to the very techniques which make foreign language students better decoders than communicants. For this reason the teacher should view language "as a cluster of different varieties," as Strevens calls it, "each distinguishable by features of grammar or vocabulary or pronunciation, and each appropriate to particular circumstances" (6), keeping the emphasis, though, always on the communicative aspects of language. Only because many teachers regard reading and writing as a much more tangible demonstration of linguistic competence do they abandon or neglect the aural-oral aspect of language learning. It is easier for them to grade a list of words than to grade an oral expression--though one would imagine that the latter would be the easier. Above all, it seems to me, we should want our students to understand English when they hear it and to respond intelligibly and comprehensibly in English. We must strive, therefore, to eliminate "classroom" English in favor of "real" English.

4.2. Strategy v. rules

To accomplish the foregoing goals, though, requires additional consideration of whether language should be taught as a set of grammatical rules or as a set of linguistic strategies. For example, in classrooms students learn long lists of grammatical rules which, for the most part, are inapplicable in varying social contexts. Should we indeed teach our students the arbitrary distinctions between shall and will or to avoid contractions (a favorite bête noire of many teachers), when in fact contractions are simply the manifestation of "efficient

responds, "Me llamo _____." In the slot can go his nombre (given name) or apellido (family name).

6. The Teacher of English to Speakers of Other Languages

It must probably seem by now that the teacher of English to speakers of other languages--as I have described the pre-instructional considerations--needs to be a "super human" individual (with perhaps even the ability to walk on water) in order to do the job right. But the fact of the matter is that teaching English to speakers of other languages is no easy task, and it should therefore not be approached simplistically with slick pedagogical cliches. While the pre-instructional considerations discussed thus far are certainly important, the most important consideration, though, is the teacher.

6.1. Preparation and education

The great failing in the education of the teacher of English to speakers of other languages is not a lack of literary preparation in Chaucer, Shakespeare, and Milton but a lack of knowledge about the students he or she is supposed to teach, as well as a lack of knowledge of how to teach English to speakers of other languages. The preparation of teachers of English to speakers of other languages should not only involve a systematic study of the psychology of learning but it should include an understanding of the concept and nature of language. Their program of education should include such courses as the philosophy of language as well as courses in the patterns and processes of language acquisition and development as an aspect of culture and an extension of behavior. Not only should the teacher of English to speakers of other languages have studied a sequence of courses in English language and linguistics designed to prepare him for the complex job of English-as-a-second-language instruction, but he should have also completed instruction in the language and linguistics of his target students. It is not enough to have majored only in English. English language theory alone

continuity" in language--that is, in its evolution, speakers of that language tend to make its use more efficient by such means as contractions. (And this, in part, accounts for linguistic change and for the differences in that language in, say, five or six hundred years.)

Rules are the mark of the grammarian; strategy, of the linguist. Therefore, it is important to make the distinction between rules and strategy, especially if we are going to teach English to speakers of other languages in terms of linguistic science. Of what use are paradigms when the student is asked: "Is this your coat on the chair?" The student needs to know that he can respond either with "Yes, that's my coat." or with "Yes, it is." The linguistic strategy here is more important than the rules--though the rules are not to be dismissed. Otherwise, the student might respond with "Yes, it are."

4.3. Performance v. competence

In any foreign language teaching inevitably the question of performance versus competence comes up like Banquo's ghost to haunt the philosophical discussion. In distinguishing between competence and performance, Dr. A. L. Blumenthal put it this way: "If language were a game, competence would be the rules of the game, while the actions of its players would constitute performance" (Lyons and Wales, 1966:81).

Of course this is a distinction still questioned by psycholinguists, but for our purposes at the teaching level suffice to say that the distinction merely provides us with a frame of reference for the "game" of language. The rules are important, but they do not in themselves assure the "player" of success. Rather, what determines the extent to which a player becomes proficient in the game is how much he practices and gains actual experience on the playing field. In language, by extension, the rules of grammar and the techniques of performance must indeed be kept separate. For as Kate Loewenthal so aptly put it: ". . . language performance probably depends on a mechanism which is non-linguistic or sub-linguistic--a purely cognitive ability to conceptualize . . . ." (Lyons:94).

There's a lot we can do about competence, but performance is something beyond our control. Although many foreign language teachers confuse performance with competence by insisting on teaching the techniques of performance which they equate with speaking the language without an accent--or like a native. In the case of English--American English, that is--does this mean speaking English like a New Englander? Southerner? Mid-Westerner? or Westerner? Most of us would say we would be satisfied with having our students speak "standard" American English. (Britishers, I am sure, would also have their preferences.) Unfortunately, not all of us speak that way. And the way we speak is certainly going to influence how our students speak. For instance, I know a woman who was originally from Alsace-Lorraine and who married an American. Before meeting her husband she spoke no English. She proceeded to study and to practice English in the Texas community where she and her husband live. Her performance in English is exceptionally good although she speaks it with a distinct and pronounced Texas accent--similar to her husband's, her teacher's, and her neighbors', with the barest trace of a European accent.

Native-like performance is the ideal; and there are many people who learn and speak foreign languages like "natives," but most of us are victims of our particular language system which creates the kind of linguistic interference which we call "accent." Werner Von Braun's English is a good case in point. He performs well in English although he speaks it with a distinct German accent. The teacher of English to speakers of other languages must not sacrifice competence for performance. And though it is important to work on pronunciation drills, it is still important to work on the fundamentals. After all, it is not the sound of language which is important but the message which it carries.

4.4. Perception v. production

But sometimes the message might be inappropriate. For example, a Spanish-speaker of English might respond to a query with "The mother

is watching the baby" when in fact he means to say "The mother is washing the baby." However he may say it though, if he has the latter in mind, then he will think that that is what he is saying regardless of how it may come out. For the English auditor, though, it is the former which he understands. Thus, confusion.

Concisely, then, the teacher of English to speakers of other languages must deal not only with linguistic appropriateness but he must also provide his students with the necessary linguistic perception in hearing and reproducing the sounds of the target language in proper semantic strings. This is more than simply a consideration of structural patterns. It amounts to, in fact, providing the student of English with sufficient auditory discrimination to avoid saying one thing when he means another.

Thus, in terms of the example cited above, it is important to know in teaching English to Spanish-speakers that the digraph "sh" in washing does not exist in Spanish--except in the "sh" to silence people. For this reason Spanish-speakers tend to pronounce the word "wash" as "watch." In other words, they do not perceive any discernable difference in the minimal pair watching/washing when used in such sentences as "I am watching the car" and "I am washing the car."

What this all boils down to is that the teacher of English to speakers of other languages must select the right strategies in teaching his students to perceive the actual sounds of the target language and to produce them properly. Of course, in a given situation, "I am watching the car" may be understood as "I am washing the car" when the speaker is so engaged. But this places the burden of comprehension on situations that may not always be possible.

5. Cross-Cultural Correlations of Language Behavior: Tagmatic Differentials in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages

With the remarkable advances in linguistic science, considerable attention has come to be placed on the nature of language and how it is

learned, and a considerable body of research has been excavated on the "sociology of language," the "psychology of language," and the "physiology of language." But little--except for studies in contrastive analyses of phonological and grammatical structures--has been done in the full range of cross-cultural correlations of linguistic behavior--that is, the "tagmatic" differentials between languages and peoples.

Admittedly we know that Spanish-speaking peoples are different from Americans. But aside from the obvious differences of language, appearance, and customs, we really know very little about them in terms of the necessary information to successfully teach them English as a second or foreign language. Like a court-of-law, the "actual" burden of linguistic proof has fallen on the non-English speakers as learners (in some cases: victims) of English. Albert Marckwardt's testimony (p. 20) of our linguistic efforts in Puerto Rico and the Philippines bears this out. Call it lexocentrism (linguistic chauvinism or linguistic imperialism) on our part, the point is that our English-language effort with speakers of other languages has left a lot to be desired.

Truculently, perhaps, we are beginning to realize and to understand that the world of the non-English speaker is a world different from ours, though it is "physically" identical. The paradox here is that our language leads us to assume that the world is the same for all people. And though we may gratuitously admit that, yes, the world may look different peoples, nevertheless, the fact of the matter is that "in reality" a rose is a rose is a rose. Perhaps the physical world is constant and unchanging, but the truth of the matter is, as Edward Sapir postulated, that language is the [emphasis mine] guide to "social reality" (Mandelbaum, 1964:69).

And it is social reality we are dealing with as teachers of English to speakers of other languages. For this reason we need to not only take into account the previous considerations before we get to the actual teaching, but also the following cross-cultural correlations (tagmatic differentials) of language behavior in order to understand more precisely the "world" of the non-English-speaking student and to

invest our efforts with more likelihood of success.

5.1. Socio-cultural differentials

We might begin a consideration of the socio-cultural differentials by citing the culturologist Leslie White's truism: "Human behavior is not as simple as it seems"(1949:121). It is indeed a compound of the biological, the psychological, the social, the cultural, the linguistic, and other factors we can only guess at. But linguistic behavior is not a process sui generis. It is part of a larger schematic whose background is society and culture.

If, as White contends, every individual is born into a cultural environment which conditions his behavior [emphasis mine] (122), and if that culture is part of a larger society, then it stands to reason that in order to more effectively teach a foreign language to a member of some distinct socio-cultural milieu one should systematically study the socio-cultural foundation of that member. Not because the linguistic process will be any easier, but because the insights such a study yields to the teacher makes the selection of strategies easier.

Let us say we are teaching English to a non-English-speaking Pueblo Indian because we want him to be a "leader." The fact of the matter is that we may be leading him down the primrose path, for the "leader" (according to Pueblo socio-cultural standards) "is likely to be regarded as an obnoxious person, and may, in extreme cases, be done away with on a charge of sorcery" (White:127). In such a case it would be important to fix our linguistic direction another way. However, without knowledge of the socio-cultural determinants, we may innocently do a great deal of harm. Unfortunately, American teachers of English to speakers of other languages have been notoriously shamanistic in their work.

The ethos of a people is decidedly bound by socio-cultural ligatures and linguistic ties. What might be linguistically permissible in one ethos may be prohibited in another. Thus, the linguistic selection of the teacher should be influenced by the knowledge of the student's background. English-language learning should be more than a "come-and-get-

it" affair.

More specifically, though, let us consider the polite and personal forms of address in Spanish for which there are no English equivalents, except by addressing someone either by their first name or as Mr. So-and-so. Perhaps the democratic nature of most English-speaking countries has been influenced by the elimination of these non-democratic forms of address. Nevertheless, the nature of American society and culture reduces linguistic distance (in most cases) to immediate informality. No so in Spanish. The teacher must be careful how she addresses her adult Spanish-speaking students, otherwise she may get nowhere with those who resent her easy familiarity--and perhaps her addressing them with the personal form. Thus, cross-cultural correlations work both ways.

5.2. Psycho-linguistic differentials

It is all too easy to fall into tacit assumptions about the psychology of the non-English speaker in terms of his linguistic behavior. Although linguistic behavior is indeed an indicator to the psychology of the non-English speaker, the fact remains that such tacit assumptions are, for the most part, arrived at by the most superficial observations. For example, one such tacit assumption about Mexican Americans is that they do not want to learn English because they are always speaking Spanish; ergo, there's no use in trying to teach them English. Besides--they only butcher it anyway.

The psycho-linguistic nature of the non-English speaker is a complex and baffling labyrinth on whose portal are inscribed--like the entrance to Dante's inferno--the words of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis of linguistic relativity. Amplifying the hypothesis, Hertzler wrote:

> Each language operates as an instrument which guides its habitual users in observing, reacting and expressing themselves. It provides for the speakers a combination of attitudinal atmosphere and conceptual platform, which is spoken of commonly as their Weltanschauung. Each language "marks off" for its native speakers all of their "working" interpretations of reality--their interpretation

> of what they comprehend as essences, things, forms, processes, actions, time and temporal sequence, space and distance, quantities and qualities, and the manner in which they comprehend these. In considerable part, it provides its speakers, as members of a linguistic, and hence, of a common cultural community, with what they are aware of, what they imagine, believe, and feel, their ideas--in short what they think about and the way they think. It carries for its speakers their connotations and interpretations of what is existential, important and valuable in the universe (118).

Thus, the perceptions of the non-English speaker are molded and colored by his language. However, in terms of psycho-linguistic differentials, let us say, between the non-English speaker's language and English, the distinct processes of coding and decoding in the respective languages assume significant importance in the teaching context. The individual student's grammar for generating sentences in his own language may be an asset or a liability in learning English. Therefore, recognition of such psycho-linguistic differentials adds to the tactical strategies of the teacher. In addition, the student's lexical boundaries may inhibit second language learning in which the concepts have no correlation in the student's linguistic domain. Here, too, like the question of competence and performance, little data is available to account for individual differences in linguistic behavior, much less for cross-cultural correlations (Rosenberg:10).

Of course, success in acquiring a second language depends to a large extent upon the attitudes and ethnocentric tendencies of the student as well as the teacher. If the student's aim is trans-cultural assimilation, he may be more likely to make strident progress. On the other hand, such an attitude on the part of the teacher may only erode the learning context. To a great extent, psycho-linguistic differentials depend on socio-cultural compatibility. In all cases, though, the teacher of English to speakers of other languages must guard against the debilitating effects of anomie, "the feelings of social uncertainty or dissatisfaction which sometimes characterize . . . the serious student of a second language" (Allen:39).

5.3. Phono-physiological differentials

The most concentrated effort on the part of applied linguistics has been in the area of contrastive analyses of the phonological systems of English and other languages. The University of Michigan studies (1958) were based on the contrastive sounds between English and Spanish. Earlier, the American Council of Learned Societies had produced nine volumes of contrastive studies emphasizing stress and intonation but which were never published (Marckwardt, Linguistic Reporter, 1967:3). More recently the Center for Applied Linguistics undertook a series of contrastive studies in order to improve "the planning of courses, and the development of actual classroom techniques" (Stockwell, Sounds of English and Spanish, 1965:v). In June, 1961, an excellent contrastive piece was published in English, A New Language, journal of the Commonwealth Office of Education, Sydney, Australia, entitled: "Some Likely Areas of Difficulty for Spanish Students of English" (Allen:135).

As I commented earlier (pp. 23-24), the teacher of English to speakers of other languages should not sacrifice competence for performance. However, contrastive analyses of the sound systems of English and other languages should shape the task of the teaching the sounds of English more productively by concentrating on the differences than on the similarities. For example, contrastive analyses of English and Spanish sound systems show that the English sounds most likely to give the Spanish-speaker trouble are the vowels. In Spanish the vowels have rather constant sound values, whereas in English they vary according to their "alphalogical" arrangement. In the word want, for instance, a has the value of ʌ , whereas in the word waste it has the value of ə. In Spanish, the vowel has the constant value of ə as the u in the word up.

Contrastive analysis, therefore, spotlights the specific areas of likely difficulty so that our selections and strategies are cogently to the point (Zintz, 1963:216-217). It should be noted, however, that contrastive analysis further impels us to look for equivalent sounds in English. For example, the a in waste can be contrasted to the ue digraph in the Spanish word buey. There is no Spanish equivalent sound for the

a in want--this is where the teacher's linguistic acumen comes into play (Rosen and Ortego, 1969:7ff). Consider the word judge. The Spanish j sounds like English h. Thus the sound of ǰ is not an inherent sound in Spanish although it does exist in the idiolects of many Spanish speakers (singers especially) when they pronounce ya as ǰa. Consequently, consideration of the phono-physiological differentials can mean the difference between competence and performance.

5.4. Grammatic-syntactical differentials

Like the phono-physiological differentials between English and other languages, the grammatic-syntactical differentials between English and other languages have been illuminated by contrastive studies in grammatical and syntactical structures. It is important to note here, as Stockwell, Bowen, and Martin point out, that these contrastive studies do not constitute a methodology or a theory of learning but rather "the nature of the conflicts between the structure of a language which has already been learned and the structure of one which is still to be learned" (1965:vii). While the phono-physiological differences tend to be more tightly closed in a smaller, finite system, the grammatic-syntactical differences between two language systems tend to be "larger and less manageable," as Stockwell, Bowen, and Martin indicate (1).

The most important aspect of the grammatic-syntactical differentials is"word order," for the differences in the order of words in both English and Spanish sentences, for example, signal the differences in meaning. The teacher of English to speakers of other languages must therefore deal strategically with the typical sentence patterns of the two languages. For example, a typical Spanish sentece pattern might be: NP:Subj+VP-ser+ NP:Pred. "El+es+un+buen amigo." The same pattern exists in English: "He+is+a good friend." However, in Spanish, unlike English, the subject pronoun El can be eliminated from the sentence without distorting or altering the intended meaning of the sentence:"Es un buen amigo." However, if we change the English sentence to "She is a good friend," the sentence VP and NP:Pred. remain the same, whereas in Spanish the whole

sentence is altered to "Ella es una buena amiga." In other words, sentence patterns in Spanish require a concordance that is not present in English sentence structure. Moreover, in English the NP:Subj. can be contracted with the VP to He's and She's.

Additionally, the morphology of each language--the kinds of affixes used and the kinds of grammatical functions involved--needs to be understood by the teacher in order to provide the student with significant instruction to acquire the target language. Such things as lexical and syntactic range are also important understandings for the teacher. Furthermore, the denotative range of both languages is equally important for the necessary linguistic transfer from one language to another. For example, in Spanish "Pintó la casa " means "(He) painted the house." However, "Se pintó " does not mean "He painted himself." It means "He flew the coop." But the point here is that such expressions cannot simply be treated under the rubric of "idiom" as has been traditionally the case.

5.5. Semantic-cognitive differentials

Of course "Se pintó " could mean "He painted himself " but the semantic-cognitive structure of Spanish restricts this kind of ambiguity--not withstanding the absurdity of such an act--although there are certainly semantic ambiguities in Spanish as in all other languages. In Spanish, for example, "la segunda frente" could mean "the second front" (as in a war), but more likely it may mean an adulterous affair of a rather permanent nature involving maintenance, etc.

Thus, perhaps the most important set of tagmatic differentials to consider in cross-cultural correlations are the semantic-cognitive differentials. What the words of a language mean and the concepts they convey are of prime importance in language learning. After all, a man's beliefs are the product of what he thinks the words of his beliefs mean. Therefore, it is important to know how our non-English-speaking students think, and the extent, let us say, to which their language contributes to ambiguity and misconceptions. In English, for instance, the sentence

"They are hunting dogs " can mean two things depending on the stress and intonation. However, a non-English speaker could miss the stress and intonation and as a consequence totally misunderstand the intent of the statement.

In terms of semantic-cognitive differentials, the materials used by the teacher need to be properly selected for suitability and acceptability as well as for meaning. The degree of precision and certainty which can be achieved in a second language depend upon influences operating to enhance or deter such precision and certainty in the student's language. As "lexistents" (linguistic creatures) we depend upon words to give meaning to life; and in many instances we are prone to be satisfied with equational answers or tautologies like "War is peace" where peace equals war. In the same way, we may see something we don't recognize. Inquiring, the explanation may be "That's a Juniper tree." "Oh?" we respond. Or, "Oh." This kind of explanation has satisfied our curiosity even though we may know nothing about what a juniper is. It is precisely this process which causes many of us to think that the meaning of things resides in the name of the thing. But is flower the same as flor? cielo the same as sky? One could argue that they do mean the same thing, but the question of semantic identity (transliteration) belies the misapprehension different peoples have of each other. In English, for example, the word "liberal" can mean anything from a big tipper to a communist. In an English class I once observed, a Spanish-speaking student wrote the words "Mister Miner" as part of a longer sentence on the blackboard. What the teacher had actually said was "misdemeanor." True, this is a phonological breakdown, but as a result the meaning of the sentence was utterly misconstrued.

Semantic encoding in English may pose myriad problems for the non-English-speaking student. The Spanish-speaking student may want to ask, "¿Ese es su reloj?" He proceeds: "Is that your _____?" He can fill the slot with one of two semantic possibilities depending upon whether he means a clock or a watch. Similarly, semantic decoding offers its trials also. A Spanish-speaking student hears: "What's your name?" He

is but half of the second-language-learning spectrum--the other half is the target language theory. Additionally, there should be courses in contrastive linguistics (phonology and grammatical structures) and language analysis for second-language teaching. There should also be courses in the study of bilingualism as a phenomenon and its effects upon individuals (Hakes, Modern Language Journal, April, 1965). Not only should the preparation and education of the teacher of English to speakers of other languages include methodology courses but it should include courses in psychology, sociology, anthropology, etc. that will enable him to deal effectively with cross-cultural transmission and communication.

6.2. Monolingual v. bilingual

Only in recent years has much thought been given to the matter of whether the teacher of English to speakers of other languages should be bilingual--that is, "equally" conversant and fluent in the language of his students. The question has never arisen in foreign language teaching because the underlying assumption (erroneous as it often turned out to be) was that foreign language teachers were "bilingual." In English-as-a-second-language teaching, however, the assumption in fact seems to have been that such "bilinguality" was not necessary. And under this linguistic aegis thousands of English-speaking (only) teachers (British especially) have gone forth to do their duty in bringing the English language to a variety of peoples, totally ignorant of the ways and language of their target population and, like Pippa, secure in their knowledge that all was right with the world. Even our Peace Corps and Teacher Corps people have been sent (and continue to be sent) to "teach" (oftentimes English) in populations whose languages they barely (if at all) know.

The concensus of opinion on the part of language teachers today points toward the prerequisite of bilinguality on the part of any language teacher, including teachers of English to speakers of other languages. And in the United States, where Spanish-speaking youngsters are

involved, educators are voicing opinions that "the teacher of Spanish-speaking children should be bilingual" (Boyd, The Educational Forum, March, 1968:310).

The reason in obvious. Putting an English-speaking only teacher with a group of non-English-speaking students is like throwing them into the middle of the river expecting them to sink or swim, as in the direct-association method mentioned earlier. On the other hand, the properly trained bilingual teacher can lead his students to "mastery" of the target language via the necessary explanations in the student's "native" language. This is not going back to that first piano teacher in DeCamp's illustration. Rather, it is the third piano teacher we are talking about, the one who will not hesitate to provide an explanation as well as a demonstration as the situation may warrant.

6.3. Ethnic v. non-ethnic

We finally arrive at the question of whether the teacher of English to speakers of other languages should be a member of the same non-English-speaking ethnic group he is teaching. Some educators see this as a disadvantage, in that, as they say, the ethnic teacher becomes a more severe judge and critic of his or her "own kind" and, thus, the learning becomes difficult for the students. As one educator told me, talking about Spanish-speaking children in the Southwest, Spanish-speaking Mexican American teachers simply tend to reinforce their acquired middle-class Anglo values on Spanish-speaking children to their detriment. What this educator failed to realize, however, was that such reinforcement may be equally applied by Spanish-speaking Anglo American teachers.

The advantage as more and more Spanish-speaking Mexican American teachers of English to Spanish-speakers see it, for example, is that the student may be motivated by seeing that someone like him has "made" it--that is, has learned and mastered the target language. This whole question of "models" has become an increasingly important one especially in the area of "bilingual education" for Spanish-speaking youngsters in the Southwest.

Moreover, the substantial advantages of a "bilingual" teacher teaching non-English-speaking students of his own ethnic background are that such a teacher knows first hand and "intuitively" the kinds of linguistic problems his students are likely to have. However, this is not to say that only bilingual "ethnic" teachers should teach English to non-English speakers of particular ethnic groups or ethnic groups of their own background. On the contrary, this fact alone does not guarantee success for the students. There are in fact many excellent bilingual teachers who continue to teach English as a second language successfully to peoples of ethnic backgrounds different from theirs. The selection of such "bilingual" teachers of English to speakers of other languages should ultimately be made not on the basis of any preconceived notions but on the basis of ability.

7. A Linguistic Model for Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages

There are other things, of course, that need to be considered in teaching English to speakers of other language--especially youngsters--things like (1) timing of second language instruction and (2) individual child status. Acording to Rosen and Ortego, "timing and age factors represent an important instructional consideration" (Journal of Reading Behavior, Winter, 1969:53). The authors point out that "the inadequate time and handling of the development of English in Spanish-speaking children [for example] can contribute towards the creation of a type of bilingual who is inadequate in English, insecure in his own language, and probably lacking in general verbal development as well" (53-53). Individual child status involves such considerations as "socio-economic, geographic and regional influences" (57).

Teaching English to speakers of other languages is far from an easy task as we can see in light of the multidimensional considerations enumerated thus far. But perhaps this may have been the root of the problem--that too many teachers of English to speakers of other languages

simply regarded the task of second-language teaching as nothing more than "another subject"--one for which the least preparation or consideration was required. Little wonder that English-as-second-language programs failed so desperately.

Not only have we become cognizant of the constellation of pre-instructional variables, but we have made great strides in the instructional methodology itself.

7.1. Objectives and stages of instruction

In the study of any foreign language, the expressed objectives should be "the active control of the language in order to understand and express one's self clearly and effectively within the range of one's experiences and needs" (Ortego and Bateman, 1964:2). The achievement of this objective usually involves the following stages: (1) listening (recognition and understanding), (2) imitation, (3) repetition, (4) variation (substitution), and (5) self-expression (selection).

Recognition means the ability to discriminate between the different sounds of the language, particularly in words such as _seat_ and _sit_, which are called "minimal pairs" (because acoustically they contain only one phonemic change). As Ortego and Bateman put it:

> Before the spoken word can be comprehended, there must be careful and purposeful listening to discern sounds, patterns, and melodies that characterize the language, associating sound with meaning, inferring the meaning of words from the context in which they occur. To promote purposeful listening, there should be abundant opportunity for systematic, intensive practice. Purposeful listening leads to the reproduction of sounds heard, intonation, and understanding (2).

Listening should be followed by "imitation" which requires the student to reproduce the sounds he has been hearing, like "Please _sit_ down " or "Is this your _seat_?" It is in this stage where the teacher's knowledge of contrastive linguistics plays an important part. In Spanish, for example, there is no initial _s_ sound, so that in English _seat_ comes out as _eseat_. The teacher should have already developed certain exer-

cises to overcome this phono-physiological difficulty.

According to Evans and Baldwin, imitation fulfills three functions: (1) It provides a review of the sounds of the item, (2) it strengthens the concept of the meaning of the item, and (3) it elicits active participation on the student's part without taxing the memory since they are reacting to the direct stimulus of a model (1963:M3).

In the repetition stage, the teacher should begin with model intonations and listen-repeat exercises. Rudimentary pronunciation drills and mimetic responses provide the basis from which to progress to more elementary manipulation of basic contextual vocabulary. Using high frequency vocabulary and structures, the teacher should be able to condition students to respond instantaneously. Structure saturation will yield to situation comprehension, then to controlled situation responses, and eventually to personal non-directed reactions and responses.

The substitution stage provides the student with an opportunity to express a number of ideas by simply "substituting" elements in basic sentences. (This has sometimes been called the "slot-filler" theory or, more recently, "tagmemics.") This is not necessarily creative expression, but it does provide the student with some measure of manipulation not otherwise present in the preceding stages. For example, a simple substitution drill might go like this:

PERSON-NUMBER SUBSTITUTION

He is at the doctor's.	He is at the doctor's.
We _____.	We are at the doctor's.
I _____.	I am at the doctor's.
She _____.	She is at the doctor's.
You _____.	You are at the doctor's.
John and Mary _____.	John and Mary are at the doctor's.

The substitution stage helps to reinforce vocabulary and to increase mastery of structural concepts.

In the final stage, self-expression, the student is no longer restricted by patterned responses. Hopefully, by this time he will have acquired the basic vocabulary, phrases, and structures via realistic dialogues and conversations so that he can respond freely. It should be noted that this stage is not achieved specifically after the preceding

one; it should have been a part of the learning all along, as soon as the student acquired a minimal vocabulary and basic comprehension of the structures being taught. This stage, of course, involves all of the preceding ones.

7.2. Sequence of skills

As can be seen from the stages of instruction, the sequence of skills begins with listening, followed by speaking. Acquiring and developing these primary skills should be the sole aim of any basic course in teaching English to speakers of other languages. This order goes against traditionalists (grammar-translation method) who regard writing as being prior in importance to speech. The truth is that most foreign language learning goes on without benefit of writing. Learning the writing symbols of a foreign language should come only after having acquired a measure of spoken control of the language.

There is of course considerable controversy over which of the advanced skills should be taught first: reading or writing. Those who adhere strictly to the audio-lingual approach say that reading should begin as soon as the audio-lingual foundation has been laid; it may be oral, silent, intensive, extensive, or supplemental. However, a more considered approach by reading specialists indicates that the writing skill should be taken up after the audio-lingual foundation. Rosen and Ortego argue, for example, that in the case of Spanish-speaking children they "have been pushed into an English-centered reading program precipitously and thus many could not possibly be expected to succeed" (59). Since the reading process is one of decoding, it deals with an array of prerequisite characteristics, chief of which would be the ability to encode--that is, writing. (This opens up a whole new field of special competency which should affect the preparation and education of the teacher of English to speakers of other languages.)

At first the writing should involve the vocabulary of the initial presentations, conversations, and dialogues. Only after the student has thus learned the English-language code and how to encode for himself

should he go on to reading (decoding) more difficult material containing vocabulary he may have to look up for himself.

7.3. The curriculum

I have already touched on aspects of the curriculum in the preceding pages, but essentially the curriculum should begin in the student's own language--that is, explanation of the course, its objective, and so on. Then with the aid of a tape-recorder and film strips the teacher should begin the first presentation, incorporating the basic sounds, words, patterns, and structures of English. The first presentation might be something like this (all on audio-tape and film strip):

LESSON 1

Narrator: That's Mr. Jones.
That's Mr. Jones.
Narrator: Hello.
Mr. Jones: Hello.
Narrator: Are you Mr. Jones?
Mr. Jones: Yes, I'm Mr. Jones.
Do you know my wife?
Narrator: No.
Mr. Jones: (Introducing his wife)
This is Mrs. Jones.
Narrator: How do you do?
Mrs.Jones: Fine. How are you?

The initial presentation should be about 8 to 10 responses long and should be run through enough times so the student can hear the sounds of the language. The situation of the presentation should be explained in the student's language. About 3 weeks should be spent reinforcing the student's mastery of the listening-response skill, utilizing the vocabulary, expressions, and responses in the first unit of instruction. Pronunciation and comprehension are reinforced by pattern practice and structural drills both in group sessions and in individual sessions.

When the student has succeeded in repeating the utterances satisfactorily, the teacher can begin varying the presentation with:

Teacher: Who's that? (pointing to image on the screen)
Students: That's Mr. Jones.

Teacher: Hello.
Students: Hello.
Teacher: (to someone in the class)
Are you Mr. Jones?
Student: No. (Pointing to screen) That's Mr. Jones.
Teacher: (Pointing to another student)
Is that Mr. Jones?
Any student: No. (Pointing to screen)
That's Mr. Jones.

As I said before, it is not the "technorriculum" which will get the job done, but the skill, ingenuity, and competence of the teacher.

7.4. The language lab

Perhaps the best part of the "technorriculum" is the language lab--a post-World War II development made possible by the electronic age. The principal feature of the language lab is that it makes it possible to have each student listening to the target language individually whether in semi-booths or plug-in listening positions. In the acquisition and development of the primary target language skills, the language lab provides the distinct feature of enabling the student to record his utterances and to play them back for his own evaluation or the teacher's. In a sophisticated language lab the teacher can feed particular material to the students according to their individual needs. One student may require more pronunciation drill while another may need to work on replacement drills or what have you. In effect, the language lab simply extends the capability of the language teacher; it provides the student with individual instruction--a one-to-one relationship--a fundamental relationship in the learning process.

Hughes discusses the importance of the language lab as follows:

> In the conventional class, for instance, one student may recite while the others are supposed to listen and, the teacher hopes, learn by observing the mistakes of the one reciting and corrections made. As we know, however, in practice the attention of other students during a recitation is often minimal. Now, in a laboratory all the students may do the recitation at the same time without disturbing each other or creating an impossible din, because each is in a semisound-proof booth, and the teacher can spot-check

> the recitations from the console. Thus, in the time ordinarily required for three or four recitations, the teacher may be able to get thirty. Obviously, the increased frequency with which a given student recites will increase whatever skill he is acquiring by the recitation (109).

7.5. Testing and evaluation

Of course, as Finocchiaro indicates, "provisions for evaluation should be an integral part of the English [as a second language] curriculum" (107). This has been stressed by Ortego and Bateman also: "Evaluation is an integral and continuous part of the foreign language course. Student ability, progress, and achievement should be certified by tests that are frequent, systematic, purposeful, and have a positive effect in motivating pupils to better learning" (7).

Testing and evaluation does not necessarily mean written forms of tests and evaluations. Evaluating a student's pronunciation, for example, would entail only aural discrimination. To test how well a student understands the language the teacher need only give the student some tasks to perform, providing the instructions orally. The extent to which the student carries out and accomplishes the tasks should indicate how well he comprehends the language. A simple conversation would do just as well to determine the extent of the student's control of the language.

Once the student has learned to write and read, dictation tests are good instruments for assessing the audio-graphic skills of the student. Importantly, though, testing should not become an overriding factor in language learning. Above all, as Finocchiaro points out, tests should deal with the acquisition of language, not culture (115).

8. Conclusion

Second language learning is nothing new--it has been around for thousands of years. In every age, men have learned each other's languages, perhaps for as many different motives and reasons we have today.

However men have learned second languages, though, it is probably safe to assume that those who have achieved a fair degree of fluency in that language (regardless of accent) probably did so by associating with speakers of that language (apart from any "formal" study in the process). I know that in my own case, though I formally studied French as a third language, I did not <u>really</u> become <u>fluent</u> in French until I had lived in France for a period of time, "soaking" in the language and its ways.

As Moulton put it, "There is no royal road to language learning" (1966:ix). But with the right kind of effort and the right kind of teacher, the task becomes considerably less arduous--even exciting at times.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

Aarons, Alfred C. (ed.). TESOL Newsletter. Jan/Mar, 1968.

Allen, Harold B. (ed.). Teaching English as a Second Language New York, 1965.

Bach, Emmon and Robert T. Harms (eds.). Universals in Linguistic Theory. New York, 1968.

Boyd, Dorothy L. "Bilingualism as an Educational Objective," The Educational Forum. March 1968.

Brownell, John A. Japan's Second Language. NCTE: Champaign, Ill., 1967.

Carroll, John B. (ed.). Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf. New York, 1956.

DeCecco, John P. (ed.). The Psychology of Language, Thought and Instruction. New York, 1967.

Evans, James A. and Marie Baldwin. Learning French the Modern Way. New York, 1963.

Finocchiaro, Mary. English as a Second Language: From Theory to Practice. New York, 1964.

Greenberg, Joseph H. (ed.). Universals of Language. Cambridge, Mass., 1963.

Hakes, David T. "Psychological Aspects of Bilingualism," The Modern Language Journal. April, 1965.

Hertzler, Joyce O. A Sociology of Language. New York, 1965.

Hill, Archibald A. (ed.). Linguistics Today. New York, 1969.

Hill, L. A. Selected Articles on the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language. London, 1967.

Hughes, John P. Linguistics and Language Teaching. New York, 1968.

Labov, William. The Study of Non-Standard English. ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics: Wash., D. C., 1969.

Landar, Herbert. Language and Culture. New York, 1966.

Lyons, J. and R. J. Wales. Psycholinguistic Papers. Edinburgh, 1966.

Mandelbaum, David G. (ed.). Edward Sapir: Culture, Language and Personality. Berkely, Cal., 1964.

Marckwardt, Albert A. "Teaching English as a Foreign Language: A Survey of the Past Decade," The Linguistic Reporter. Oct., 1967.

Moulton, William G. A Linguistic Guide to Language Learning. MLA: New York, 1966.

Ohannessian, Sirarpi. "Harper's Ferry Conference on English Teaching as a World-Wide Problem," The Linguistic Reporter. April, 1969.

Rahman, Binito W. "Teaching English as a Second Language: A Descriptive Study," Colorado Journal of Educational Research. Winter, 1969.

Ortego, Philip D. and Anice Bateman. Guide For Teaching French. El Paso Public Schools, 1964.

Ortego, Philip D. (with Carl L. Rosen). "Language and Reading Problems of Spanish-Speaking Children in the Southwest," Journal of Reading Behavior. Winter, 1969.

Ortego, Philip D. (with Carl L. Rosen). Problems and Strategies in Teaching the Language Arts to Spanish-Speaking Mexican American Children. U.S. Office of Education (ERIC/CRESS), 1969.

Ortego, Philip D. (with Carl L. Rosen). Issues in Language and Reading Instruction of Spanish-Speaking Children. International Reading Association: Newark, 1969.

Ortego, Philip D. "The Education of Mexican Americans," The New Mexico Review. Part I: Sept, 1969; Part II: Oct, 1969.

Ortego, Philip D. "Perspectives in Language, Culture, and Behavior," International Language Reporter, Vol. XV, No. 52, Second Quarter, 1969.

Rosenberg, Sheldon (ed.). Directions in Psycholinguistics. New York, 1965.

Salus, Peter H. (ed.). On Language: Plato to von Humboldt. New York, 1969.

Stockwell, Robert P. and J. Donald Bowen. The Sounds of English and Spanish. Chicago, 1965.

Stockwell, Robert P., J. Donald Bowen, and John W. Martin. The Grammatical Structures of English and Spanish. Chicago, 1965.

Strevens, P. D. Papers in Language and Language Teaching. London, 1965.

White, Leslie A. The Science of Culture: A Study of Man and Civilization. New York, 1949.

Zintz, Miles V. Education Across Cultures. Dubuque, Iowa, 1963.

GPO 892-261